

**FIVE COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS**  
**FY 2008 CDBG RATING AND RANKING CRITERIA and APPLICANT'S PROJECT SCORE SHEET**

The Five County Association of Governments Steering Committee has established this criteria for the purpose of rating and ranking fairly and equitably all Community Development Block Grant Pre-Applications received for funding during FY 2008. Only projects which are determined to be threshold eligible will be rated and ranked. Eligibility will be determined following review of the submitted CDBG Pre-Application with all supporting documentation provided prior to rating and ranking. **Please review the attached Data Sources Sheet for a more detailed explanation of each criteria.**

<b>Applicant:</b>		<b>Requested CDBG \$'s</b>		<b>Ranking:</b>		<b>of</b>		<b>Total Score:</b>	
-------------------	--	----------------------------	--	-----------------	--	-----------	--	---------------------	--

CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria Description Five County Association of Governments		Data	Data Range/Score (circle only one for each criteria)								Score	X Weigh	Total Score
1	<b>Capacity to Carry Out The Grant:</b> Performance history of capacity to administer grant. Score comes from Worksheet #1. (First-time & <5-yr grantees: default 2.5 points)		Excellent (9-10 score) <b>4 points</b>	Very Good (7-8 score) <b>3 points</b>	Good (5-6 score) <b>2 points</b>	Fair (3-4 score) <b>1 point</b>	Poor (1-2 score) <b>0 points</b>					<b>1.0</b>	
2	<b>Grant Administration:</b> Concerted effort made by grantee to minimize grant administration costs.		100% Other Funds <b>3 points</b>	1 - 5% <b>2 points</b>	5.1 - 10% <b>1 point</b>							<b>1.0</b>	
3	<b>Job Creation:</b> Estimated number of new jobs completed project will create or number of jobs retained that would be lost without this project.		> 4 Jobs <b>4 points</b>	3-4 Jobs <b>3 points</b>	2 Jobs <b>2 points</b>	1 Job <b>1 point</b>						<b>1.5</b>	
4	<b>Unemployment:</b> What percentage is applicant County's unemployment percentage rate above State average percentage rate?	%	6% or greater  <b>3.5 points</b>	5% above state average  <b>3 points</b>	4% above state average  <b>2.5 points</b>	3% above state average  <b>2 points</b>	2% above state average  <b>1.5 points</b>	1% above state avg. <b>1 point</b>	Equal to or < state average <b>0 points</b>			<b>.5</b>	
5 A	<b>Financial Commitment to Community Development (Self-help Financing) - (<u>Jurisdiction Population &lt;500</u>)</b> Percent of non-CDBG funds invested in total project cost	%	> 10%  <b>5 points</b>	7.1 % - 10%  <b>4 points</b>	4.1% - 7%  <b>3 points</b>	1% - 4%  <b>2 points</b>	< 1%  <b>1 point</b>					<b>2.0</b>	
5 B	<b>Financial Commitment to Community Development (Self-help Financing) - (<u>Jurisdiction Population 501 - 1,000</u>)</b> Percentage of non-CDBG funds invested in total project	%	> 20%  <b>5 points</b>	15.1 - 20%  <b>4 points</b>	10.1 - 15%  <b>3 points</b>	5.1 - 10%  <b>2 points</b>	1 - 5.0%  <b>1 point</b>					<b>2.0</b>	
5 C	<b>Financial Commitment to Community Development (Self-help Financing) - (<u>Jurisdiction Population 1,001 - 5,000</u>)</b> Percentage of Non-CDBG funds invested in total project	%	> 40%  <b>5 points</b>	30.1 - 40%  <b>4 points</b>	20.1 - 30%  <b>3 points</b>	10.1 - 20%  <b>2 points</b>	1 - 10%  <b>1 point</b>					<b>2.0</b>	
5 D	<b>Financial Commitment to Community Development (Self-help Financing) - (<u>Jurisdiction Population &gt;5,000</u>)</b> Percentage of non-CDBG funds invested in total project	%	> 50%  <b>5 points</b>	40.1 - 50%  <b>4 points</b>	30.1 - 40%  <b>3 points</b>	20.1 - 30%  <b>2 points</b>	1 - 20%  <b>1 point</b>					<b>2.0</b>	

6	<b>CDBG funds Requested Per Capita:</b> CDBG funds requested divided by population. Score comes from Worksheet #1.		\$1 - 100 <b>5 points</b>	\$101-200 <b>4 points</b>	\$201- 400 <b>3 points</b>	\$401 - 800 <b>2 points</b>	\$801 or > <b>1 point</b>			<b>1.0</b>	
7 T*	<b>Jurisdiction's Project Priority:</b> Project priority rating in Regional Consolidated Plan, ( <u>Capital Investment Plan - One-Year Action Plan</u> )		High # 1 <b>5 points</b>	High # 2 <b>4 points</b>	High # 3 <b>3 points</b>	High # 4 <b>2 points</b>	High # 5 <b>1 point</b>	High # >5 <b>0 points</b>		<b>2.5</b>	
8	<b>County's Project Priority:</b> Prioritization will be determined by the three (3) appointed Steering Committee members representing the county in which the proposed project is located. The three (3) members of the Steering Committee include: one County Commission Representative, one Mayor's Representative, and one School Board Representative. (Note: for AOG application, determination is made by the Steering Committee Chair, in consultation with the AOG Executive Committee.)		# 1 <b>5 points</b>	# 2 <b>4 points</b>	# 3 <b>3 points</b>	# 4 <b>2 points</b>	# 5 <b>1 point</b>	#6 or > <b>0 points</b>		<b>2.5</b>	
9	<b>Regional Project Priority:</b> Determined by the Executive Director with consultation of the AOG Executive Committee. The Executive Committee is comprised of one (1) County Commissioner from each of the five counties.		# 1 <b>5 points</b>	# 2 <b>4 points</b>	# 3 <b>3 points</b>	# 4 <b>2 points</b>	# 5 <b>1 point</b>	#6 or > <b>0 points</b>		<b>2.5</b>	
10	<b>LMI Housing Stock:</b> Number of units constructed, rehabilitated, or made accessible to LMI residents		> 15 Units <b>4 points</b>	8 - 15 Units <b>3 points</b>	3 - 8 Units <b>2 points</b>	2 Units <b>1 point</b>				<b>1.0</b>	
11	<b>Affordable Housing Plan Implementation:</b> City has adopted an Affordable Housing Plan and this project specifically demonstrates implementation of policies in the Plan (Criteria required by the State Legislature). Towns applying for credit under this criteria may <u>either</u> meet a goal in their adopted Affordable Housing Plan or the project meets a regional affordable housing goal in the Consolidated Plan.		YES <b>2 points</b>	No <b>0 points</b>						<b>1.0</b>	
12	<b>Project's Geographical Impact:</b> Area benefitting from project.		Regional <b>6 points</b>	Multi-county <b>5 points</b>	County-wide <b>4 points</b>	Multi-community <b>3 points</b>	Community <b>2 points</b>	Portion of Community <b>1 point</b>		<b>1.5</b>	
13	<b>Applicant's County Per Capita Income (PCI):</b> as compared to State's PCI to target distressed areas from 2000 Census.	%	70% or < <b>5 points</b>	71 - 80% <b>4 points</b>	81 - 90% <b>3 points</b>	90 - 100% <b>2 points</b>	100-110% <b>1 point</b>	> 110% <b>0 points</b>		<b>1.0</b>	
14	<b>Jurisdiction's Property Tax Rate:</b> In response to higher demand for services, many communities have already raised tax rates to fund citizen needs. The communities that maintain an already high tax burden (as compared to the tax ceiling set by state law) will be given higher points for this category. Property tax rate as a percent of the maximum allowed by law (3 point default for non-taxing jurisdiction)	%	61% or > <b>5 points</b>	51 - 60% <b>4 points</b>	41 - 50% <b>3 points</b>	31 - 40% <b>2 points</b>	21 - 30% <b>1 point</b>	< 20% <b>0 points</b>		<b>1.0</b>	
15	<b>Jurisdiction's LMI Population:</b> Percent of residents considered LMI (based on 2000 Census Data or Survey)	%	91 - 100% <b>5 points</b>	81 - 90% <b>4 points</b>	71 - 80% <b>3 points</b>	61 - 70% <b>2 points</b>	51 - 60% <b>1 point</b>			<b>1.0</b>	

16	<b>Extent of Poverty:</b> If an applicant satisfactorily documents the percentage of Low Income (LI - 50%) and Very Low Income (VLI - 30%) persons directly benefitting from a project; or can show the percentage of Low Income/Very Low Income of the community as a whole; additional points shall be given in accordance with the following. Percentage of total population of jurisdiction or project area who are low income and very low income.	%	20% or More  <b>5 points</b>	15 - 19%  <b>4 points</b>	10 - 14%  <b>3 points</b>	5 - 9%  <b>2 points</b>	1 - 4%  <b>1 point</b>			<b>1.0</b>	
17	<b>Presumed LMI Group:</b> Project specifically serves CDBG identified LMI groups, i.e. elderly, disabled, homeless, etc., as stipulated in CDBG Application Guide	%	100%  <b>5 points</b>	80 - 99%  <b>4 points</b>	60 - 79%  <b>3 points</b>	51 - 59%  <b>2 points</b>				<b>1.0</b>	
18	<b>Successful Participation in Quality Growth Community Program:</b> Reflects on communities pro-active for growth and needs through planning and land use in their communities; coordination and cooperation with other governments; development of efficient infrastructure; incorporation of housing opportunity and affordability in community planning; and protection and conservation plan for water, air, critical lands, important agricultural lands and historic resources. Score comes from Worksheet #18.		Very High  <b>4 points</b>	High  <b>3 points</b>	Fair  <b>2 points</b>	Low  <b>1 point</b>				<b>1.0</b>	
19	<b>Application Quality:</b> Application identifies problem, contains a well-defined scope of work and is cost-effective. Score comes from Worksheet #19.		Excellent  <b>6 points</b>	Very Good  <b>5 points</b>	Good  <b>4 points</b>	Fair  <b>3 points</b>	Acceptable  <b>2 points</b>	Poor  <b>1 point</b>		<b>2.0</b>	
20	<b>Project Maturity:</b> Project demonstrates capacity to be implemented and/or completed in the 18 month contract period and is clearly documented. Score comes from Worksheet #20.		Excellent  <b>6 points</b>	Very Good  <b>5 points</b>	Good  <b>4 points</b>	Fair  <b>3 points</b>	Acceptable  <b>2 points</b>	Poor  <b>1 point</b>		<b>2.0</b>	

**PLEASE NOTE:** Criteria marked with a T\* is a THRESHOLD eligibility requirement for the CDBG Program.

< = Less Than    > = More Than

**Previously Allocated Set-Aside Funding:**

**\$150,000 – Five County AOG (Planning and Technical Assistance Grant)**

**\$131,664 – Iron County on behalf of Iron County Council on Aging (New Senior Citizens Center in Parowan, year 2 of multi-year project)**

CRITERIA 1 WORKSHEET

STATE OF UTAH DIVISION OF HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT - GRANTEE PERFORMANCE RATING										
10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	_____ Total (10 possible)
Excellent ⇐ _____ (Circle One) _____ ⇒ Poor										
Person Providing Evaluation: (Circle)      Keith      Cheryl      Glenna										

Excellent    =    9 to 10  
Very Good    =    7 to 8  
Good          =    5 to 6  
Fair          =    3 to 4  
Poor          =    1 to 2

CRITERIA 18 WORKSHEET

SUCCESSFUL PARTICIPATION IN QUALITY GROWTH COMMUNITY PROGRAM		
Criteria	Support Documentation Provided	Score (4 Points Total)
1. Has the local jurisdiction provided information demonstrating pro-active planning and land use in their community in coordination and cooperation with other governments?	Yes____ 1 point    No____ 0 points <b>1 point</b>	
2. Has the applicant documented that the project is in accordance with an <u>adopted</u> master plan (i.e., water facilities master plan, etc.)	Yes____ 1 point    No____ 0 points <b>1 point</b>	
3. Has the applicant documented an <u>non-exclusionary policy</u> for housing affordability and opportunity in community planning (i.e. General Plan housing policies, development fee deferral policies, etc.)	Yes____ 1 point    No____ 0 points <b>1 point</b>	
4. Has the applicant documented adopted plans or general plan elements addressing conservation of water, air, critical lands, important agricultural lands and historic resources?	Yes____ 1 point    No____ 0 points <b>1 point</b>	
		<b>Total Points</b>

Very High    =    4 points  
High         =    3 points  
Fair          =    2 points  
Low          =    1 point

CRITERIA 19 WORKSHEET

APPLICATION QUALITY			
Criteria	Support Documentation	Other Documentation	Score (10 Points Total)
1. Problem Identification	Additional written text provided? Yes____ 1 point    No____ 0 points <b>1 point</b>	Detailed Architectural/Engineering Report prepared? Yes____ 2 points    No____ 0 points <b>2 points</b>	
2. Is proposed solution well defined in Scope of Work? In other words, is solution likely to solve problem?	Yes____ 1 point    No____ 0 points <b>1 point</b>		
3. Does the application give a concise description of how the project will be completed in a timely manner?	Yes____ 1 point    No____ 0 points <b>1 point</b>		
4. Proposed project does <u>not</u> duplicate any existing services or activities already available and provided to beneficiaries in that jurisdiction through other programs, i.e. those locally or regionally based.	Yes____ 5 points <b>(Does not Duplicate)                      5 points</b>  No____ 0 points <b>(Duplicates Services)                      0 points</b>		
			<b>Total Points</b>

Excellent    =    10 points  
Very Good   =    9 points  
Good         =    8 points

Fair            =    7 points  
Acceptable   =    6 points  
Poor          =    5 points

CRITERIA 20 WORKSHEET

PROJECT MATURITY		
Criteria	Status	Score (6 Points Total)
1. Architect/Engineer already selected at time of application through formal RFP process	Yes____ 1 point    No____ 0 points <b>1 point</b>	
2. Has application identified dedicated and involved project manager?	Yes____ 1 point    No____ 0 points <b>1 point</b>	
3. Is the proposed solution to problem identified in the Scope of Work <u>ready to proceed immediately</u> ?	(Well Defined) Yes____ 1 point    No____ 0 points <b>1 point</b>	
4. Has applicant identified all funding sources?	Yes____ 1 point    No____ 0 points <b>1 point</b>	
5. Funding Status (Maturity)	All other project funding is applied for but not committed. Yes____ 1 point    No____ 0 points <b>1 point</b> <b>(or)</b> All other project funding is in place for immediate use. Yes____ 1 point    No____ 0 points <b>2 points</b> <b>(or)</b> Is CDBG the only funding source for the project? Yes____ 1 point    No____ 0 points <b>2 points</b>	
		<b>Total Points</b>

Excellent    =    6 points  
Very Good    =    5 points  
Good         =    4 points

Fair         =    3 points  
Acceptable    =    2 points  
Poor         =    1 point